

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/617,881	07/14/2003	Randy Westlund	06809.0018-03000	3418
22852	7590 07/05/2006		EXAMINER	
	N, HENDERSON, FA	SCHAETZLE, KENNEDY		
LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			3766	
			DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Offi A C O	10/617,881	WESTLUND ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3766				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under the process of the condition of	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims	•	,				
4) Claim(s) 40-64 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrand 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 40-64 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2003 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	wn from consideration. or election requirement. er. accepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/20/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3766

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the applications listed in the "Cross-reference to Related Applications" section must be updated to reflect their current status.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 64 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. There is nothing in claim 64 that isn't already set forth in claim 61.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 3766

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 40-64 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,288. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 40 of the present invention is merely broader in scope than claims 1-58 of the patent. Once the applicant has received a patent for a more specific embodiment, he is not entitled to a patent for the generic or broader invention (*In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). While it is noted that claim 40 requires an electrode to be disposed proximate the distal end, those of ordinary skill in the art recognizing the claimed lead of the '288 patent to be a lead "...capable of pacing the heart..." and comprising a conductive member extending through the lead body, would have considered the use of such an electrode in order to supply the pacing pulse to the heart as totally obvious and necessary for proper operation.

Regarding method claims 61-64, the examiner has not required a restriction in the present case because the inventions are not considered to be patentably distinct. Performance of the method would necessarily require apparatus of the type claimed in the '288 patent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 40, 41, 44-48, 51-55, 58-62 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by De Lurgio et al. (Pat. No. 6,714,823).

Art Unit: 3766

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kennedy Schaetzle whose telephone number is 571 272-4954. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W and F from 9:30 -6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on M-F at 571 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KJS June 18, 2006

ENNEDY SOHAETZLE

PRIMARY EXAMIN